

DELEGATED APPLICATION REPORT

Address: 42 Rosehill Park, Reading

Application No: 172018/HOU

Proposal: Two-storey rear extension

Applicant: Mr & Mrs Watts

Date received (valid from): 15/11/17

Target Decision date: 10/01/18

Case officer: Jonathan Markwell

1. Site Description and Surrounding Area

- i. The application site comprises a detached two-storey single dwellinghouse located on the north-west corner of this part of Rosehill Park. It is the last of a row of 5 detached two-storey dwellinghouses (to the south-west), with a row of detached bungalows to the east. The surrounding area is predominantly residential in nature, although beyond the generously sized rear garden of the host property is the South Oxfordshire countryside.
- ii. The application site building is not listed, nor located within a conservation area.

2. The Proposal

- i. A householder application for planning permission is sought for a two-storey rear extension. It would be 4.3m in depth and 7.7m wide, which essentially matches the form and style of the existing building. Internally it will facilitate an enlarged living/dining/kitchen at ground floor level and an additional bedroom / dressing room at first floor level (served by a rooflight). No windows are proposed on either side elevation above ground floor level.

3. Consultation

- i. Neighbour Consultation
Neighbour letters were sent on 20/11/17. A site notice was erected by the applicant on 27/11/17. No responses have been received.
- ii. External consultation
South Oxfordshire District Council was consulted on 12/12/17. No response has been received.
- iii. Internal consultation
Ecology Consultant: The application site comprises a modern detached house where it is proposed to erect a two-storey rear extension. The house appears to be in a good condition (as viewed on Google Streetview) and is unlikely to have any significant features potentially suitable for use by roosting bats. Considering the good condition of the house, lack of records of known bat roosts within the vicinity, and the extent of the works, it is unlikely that bats or other protected species will be adversely affected by the proposals. As such, there are no ecology related objections to this application.

4. Plans & Documents Considered

- i. The Council, in reaching its recommendation, has taken into consideration the following plans & documents:

17156.01.001 Rev P1 - Site Location Plan

.02.001 Rev P1 - Site layout as existing

.03.001 Rev P1 - Plans as existing
.05.001 Rev P1 - Elevations as existing

.02.002 Rev P1 - Site layout as proposed
.03.002 Rev P1 - Plans as proposed
.05.002 Rev P1 - Elevations as proposed

All received on 13/11/17

5. Relevant Planning History

None.

6. Equality Act 2010:

In determining this application the Council is required to have regard to its obligations under the Equality Act 2010. However, there is no indication or evidence (including from consultation on the application) that the protected groups identified by the Act have or will have different needs, experiences, issues and priorities in relation to this particular planning application. Therefore in terms of the key equalities protected characteristics it is considered there would be no significant adverse impacts as a result of the development.

7. Relevant Planning Guidance

- i. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that proposals be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The Development Plan for Reading relevant to the application site comprises the Reading Local Development Framework 'Core Strategy' 2008 (Altered 2015) and 'Sites and Detailed Policies Document' 2012 (Altered 2015).

The 'National Planning Policy framework' ('NPPF') 2012 states clearly that its content is to be a material consideration in the determination of applications. The 'NPPF' states that due weight should be given to the adopted policies of the Local Development Framework (LDF) (Core Strategy and Sites and Detailed Policies Document) according to their degree of consistency with the 'NPPF' (the closer the policies in the plan to the policies in the 'NPPF', the greater the weight that may be given). Accordingly, the 'NPPF' and the following development plan policies and supplementary planning guidance are relevant:

8. Relevant Policies

- i. The application has been assessed against the following policies:

National

National Planning Policy Framework;

National Planning Policy Guidance;

RBC Local Development Framework

Core Strategy 2008 (Altered 2015)

CS7 Design and the Public Realm

CS34 Pollution and water resources

CS36 Biodiversity and Geology

Sites and Detailed Policies Document 2012 (Altered 2015)

SD1 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
DM4 Safeguarding amenity
DM9 House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation
DM12 Access, Traffic and Highway-Related Matters

RBC Supplementary Planning Documents

SPG - A Design Guide to House Extensions (2003)

9. Appraisal

i. The main issues are considered to be:

- Design
- Amenity

ii. Design and impact on the character of the surrounding area

The proposed extension, although acknowledged to be expansive given its 2-storey nature, full width and 4.3m depth, is not considered to be significantly harmful within the context of the host building, streetscene or prevailing character of the area. The proposal seeks to simply extend the house further back at both floors in line with the existing arrangement. Unusually the application site is located at a corner point, meaning that both neighbouring properties increase in distance from the footprint of the development as it progresses to the rear. As such, the amount of harm caused is considered to be limited. Although this would be evident from the streetscene (from the south-east looking west), this is not considered to be significantly harmful given the existing context and arrangements. The applicant has specified that the proposal will utilise matching materials and this is considered an appropriate approach and helps mitigate what could otherwise be considered an inappropriate additional scale. Thus, on balance, the proposals are considered appropriate in design terms, aligning with policies CS7 and DM9.

iii. Amenity

The proposals are not considered to have any significant adverse impacts on the amenity of any nearby occupiers. No new windows are proposed on the side elevations at first floor level, meaning no significantly harmful additional overlooking would be created by the proposals. Although there would be some loss of outlook / sense of enclosure to both neighbouring occupiers as a result of the proposals, the significant distances to both boundaries (4.2m to No. 44 and 3.6m to No. 40) mitigates the level of harm so that it is not significant enough to warrant the refusal of the proposals on these grounds. In terms of day/sunlight, no significant loss of either is anticipated to either neighbouring property. In all other amenity related regards no significantly harmful impacts are envisaged for neighbouring occupiers. On the rear elevation the replacement fenestration will be on a par with that existing, meaning no significantly worse overlooking opportunities at this point. The height/footprint of the extension, in the context of that already existing, is such that no significant loss of daylight/sunlight, outlook/overbearing impacts are envisaged.

For current and future occupiers of the host dwelling, the proposed works will improve the quality of accommodation provided at the site. The proposal would also maintain a sufficiently sized rear amenity space.

10. Conclusion

- i. Having regard to the material considerations and all matters raised, the Local Planning Authority considers that the balance of considerations therefore weigh in favour of granting planning permission subject to conditions.

Recommendation

Grant Planning Permission subject to conditions;

11. Conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than three years from the date of this planning permission.

Reason: to prevent an accumulation of unimplemented planning permissions, and in accordance with Section 91 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

.02.002 Rev P1 - Site layout as proposed

.03.002 Rev P1 - Plans as proposed

.05.002 Rev P1 - Elevations as proposed

Reason: because permission is granted in respect of the development as detailed in the approved plans only.

3. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used on the existing building unless where otherwise stated on the approved plans.

Reason: in the interests of ensuring that the new development appears in keeping with the existing building in accordance with Policy CS7 of the Reading Borough LDF Core Strategy 2008 (Altered 2015) and Policy DM9 of the Reading Borough LDF Sites and Detailed Policies Document 2012 (Altered 2015).

Informatives:

1. These works may require separate approval under the Building Regulations. Please contact the Council's Building Control service for further advice on (0118) 937 2449.
2. Your attention is drawn to the terms and conditions of this permission. Any development which is carried out but differs materially from the approved plans and details, or does not comply with any condition (s) or planning obligation (s) attached to the permission may result in the Council taking action to remedy the breach of planning control. If you are in any doubt please contact the council.
3. The determination of this planning application required no issues to be resolved, so officers have worked positively and proactively to provide a recommendation for approval within the statutory timescale.
4. Complaints are commonly received about noise and dust caused by construction and demolition works, particularly working outside reasonable hours and smoke from bonfires associated with the burning of waste on site. The developer is reminded that construction and demolition associated with the approved development will be subject to environmental health law.

5. The attention of the applicant is drawn to Section 59 of the Highways Act 1980, which enables the Highway Authority to recover expenses due to damage caused by extraordinary traffic.